

REMARKS

Claims 1-51 are the claims currently pending in the Application.

Claims 1, 12, 21, 29, 37, 47 and 51 are amended to clarify features recited thereby.

Rejection of Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Timothy Bickmore et al., "Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users", The Computer Journal, Volume 42, No. 6, 1999 ("Bickmore"). This rejection is traversed.

Independent claim 21 requires, *inter alia*, a font determined by the gateway server based on the language notified to the gateway server.

Bickmore discloses the Digestor system, in which users of the wireless device specify a size of a font in order to allow the system to estimate a screen area of a text block to configure the Digestor system (Bickmore, Paragraph 3.1). Bickmore discloses re-authoring Web documents for the display needs of wireless devices through a series of transformations performed on the Web document (Bickmore, Paragraphs 2.4 and 2.6). Bickmore further discloses a series of rules to be kept in mind for designing the image reduction and re-authoring techniques.

The Examiner acknowledges that Bickmore does not disclose determining the font by reference to at least one of a language selected in the wireless client and the user information database which includes user information stored in advance (Office Action, page 5). Therefore, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn at this time.

Rejection of Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 21, 29, 37, 40, 47 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 21, 29, 37, 40, 47 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious from Bickmore in view of Zanchi, U.S. Patent No. 5, 814,798. This rejection is traversed.

Independent claims 1, 12, 29, 37, 47 and 51 require, *inter alia*, determining the font by reference to a language selected in the wireless client.

The Examiner acknowledges that Bickmore does not disclose determining the font by reference to at least one of a language selected in the wireless client and the user information database which includes user information stored in advance (Office Action, page 5). However, the Examiner alleges that Zanchi discloses these features.

Zanchi discloses managing personal preference attributes in a personal application device, such as a cellular telephone, connected via the world wide web to a computer that stores attribute information including font data (Zanchi, Fig. 7; col. 4, lines 14-53); such that a portable memory card or widely accessible database may store user preferences or user attributes data received from the personal application device (Zanchi, Id).

Zanchi does not disclose or suggest determining the font by reference to a language selected in the wireless client, and the Examiner does not allege that it does so. Zanchi does not disclose or suggest referring to language information, as *inter alia*, required by independent claims 1, 12, 29, 37, 47 and 51. Clearly, Zanchi does not disclose or suggest a gateway server that determines the font by reference to such

information, as further required by independent claims 1, 12, 29, 37, 47 and 51.

Therefore, Zanchi does not disclose or suggest the recitations of independent claims 1, 12, 29, 37, 47 and 51.

Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1, claim 16 depends from independent claim 12, and claim 40 depends from independent claim 37. Therefore, claims 5, 16 and 40 incorporate novel and nonobvious features of their respective independent base claims and are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 3, 14 and 22

Claims 3, 14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious from over Bickmore and Kovacs. This rejection is traversed.

As discussed in the Amendment filed June 29, 2004, Kovacs does not qualify as prior art under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to remove Kovacs as a reference against the present Application.

Further, even if Kovacs did qualify as prior art, Kovacs does not remedy the deficiencies of Bickmore as they relate to Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 12 and 21, from which claims 3, 14 and 22 depend. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious from Bickmore and the Official Notice taken by the Examiner. This rejection is traversed.

The Official Notice does not remedy the deficiencies of Bickmore as they relate to Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 12, 21, 29, 37, 37 and 47. Claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 depend from independent claims 1, 12, 21, 29, 37, 37 and 47, respectively, and thus incorporate novel and nonobvious features thereof. Accordingly, claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective independent base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Therefore, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42

Claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious from Bickmore and Simon. This rejection is traversed.

Simon does not remedy the deficiencies of Bickmore as they relate to applicants invention and his claimed in independent claims 1, 21, 29 and 37. Therefore, since claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42 depend from these independent base claims, claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42 incorporate novel and nonobvious features thereof and are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective independent base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Therefore, this rejection

should now be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Applicant believes that the Examiner's cited grounds for rejection amount to at most grounds for objection based on the Examiner's preferences in claiming style. No amendment is believed to be required under applicable law or regulation in response to this rejection. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution, independent claim 21 is amended. This rejection should now be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



George Brieger
Registration No. 52,652

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343 Ext. 503

GB:ar